

REMARKS

Applicants are amending Claims 1-5 to clarify the claimed invention.

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claims 8-14 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form as a multiple dependent claim can not depend from another multiple dependent claim.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending Claims 8-14 to change the dependency from "any one of Claims 1 to 7" to "any one of Claims 1-6." Hence, these claims are not depend on another multiple dependent claim, and this objection has been overcome.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn, and Claims 8-14 treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzawa et al. (US 7,071,037). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that with regard to, for example, independent Claim 1, that Suzawa teaches a semiconductor device comprising a transparent conductive film (Col. 11) and a plurality of thin film transistors (Fig. 15) having a semiconductor thin film (1001 & 1002b) over a substrate having an insulating surface (1004) and an electrode or a wiring formed by stacking a first conductive layer (1002a) in contact with the

semiconductor thin film and a second conductive layer (1003) on the first conductive layer wherein the first conductive layer has a larger width than the second conductive layer. The Examiner admits that Suzawa fails to disclose the transparent conductive film to be in contact with a part of the first conductive film extending from an end portion of the second conductive layer. The Examiner, however, contends that Suzawa teaches the transparent conductive film to be formed over the entire surface, and that although Suzawa does not explicitly teach the two films to be touching, the Examiner argues that it can be reasonably inferred from the embodiments disclosed by Suzawa that the two films are minimally in indirect optical/electrical contact with each other since each of the layers of the device work together to function. The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art for the two films to be at least indirectly in optical/electrical contact with each other. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Suzawa, reference numeral 1003 is a pixel electrode (see Col. 2) and corresponds more closely to a transparent conductive film of Claim 1 (i.e. a transparent pixel electrode) than the claimed second conductive film. If this is the case, then Suzawa does not disclose the claimed second conductive layer. If one were to argue that pixel electrode 1003 in Suzawa corresponds to the claimed second conductive layer, then there is no disclosure or suggestion in Suzawa of the claimed transparent conductive film. Therefore, the number of films (i.e. layers) disclosed in Suzawa is different than that claimed in independent Claim 1, and hence, Suzawa does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1.

Applicants note that one of the objects of the claimed invention is to connect a wiring and an electrode, or the like, formed from two incompatible films (e.g. an ITO film and an aluminum film),

without increasing the cross-sectional area of the wiring, and to achieve a lower power consumption, even when the screen size becomes larger. In contrast, Suzawa appears to be directed to providing a method for reducing in the number of photomasks used in manufacturing in order to improve productivity. Thus, Suzawa is directed to a different concept than the present invention.

Therefore, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Suzawa. For similar, reasons, independent Claims 2-6 are also not disclosed or suggested by Suzawa. Accordingly, independent Claims 1-6 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Suzawa, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: December 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568